

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al US Patent No. 6, 097,374 in view of the Official Notice taken by the Examiner is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 7 are directed to a method for accessing a computer at a first location to view, create, modify and/or transfer information to and from the computer using a video monitor, browser and keyboard processor unit at a second location which is remote from said first location. Claim 6 has been amended to clarify any misunderstanding regarding the subject invention. The operator is located at a location referred to as the second location which is at a substantial distance from the first location where the computer resides. The operator uses the keyboard processor unit in conjunction with the video monitor at the second location to access information from the computer at the first location. The accessed information is displayed on the video monitor at the second location. The operator then determines from the accessed information whether and to what extent the information stored in the computer at the first location should be modified or to what extent additional information should be added.

This is entirely different from the teaching in Howard et al '37 in which a wrist pendent Keyboard system having a complex optical matrix array of sensors is shown and disclosed for communicating to a Host system at a distant location.

Although the Host system is a computer based data processing or communication system which has a video monitor associated with it the wrist pendent keyboard system does not have a video monitor associated with it nor is it intended to possess a video monitor or to be used in conjunction with a video monitor . The wrist pendent is ergonomically designed to permit movement and adjustment of its matrix geometry to alleviate excessive repetition of motion and to optically sense the depression of each key on the keyboard. Moreover, Howard teaches an array of light emitting sources 16 as taught in column 4 lines 10 -62 and as shown Figure 2 in conjunction with an array of detectors which in combination form an optical sensor matrix for optically sensing hand motion and the digit fingers of the operator such as when depressing the keys. This is a totally different system both in concept and methodology from the method of the subject invention in claims 6 and 7. The wrist pendent is not used or intended to be used at a first location in conjunction with a video monitor for communicating with the Host system at the second location. The fact that the host system has a video monitor is irrelevant to any comparison with the subject invention. Moreover whether the computer in the subject invention of claim 6 has a video monitor associated with it is also irrelevant to the subject invention. The video monitor in claim 6 is being used by the operator at the same location of the operator in conjunction with the keyboard processing unit both of which are located a substantial distant from the computer.

The Examiners reference on page 3 of the Official Communication that

D-SHO-2000-4

software browser may be included in Howard to permit selective display of data on the video monitor 14 is inconsistent with the subject invention since it is the operator who is located a substantial distance from a computer which contains the information to be accessed and displayed on a video monitor located where the operator is located and not where the computer is located as taught in Host.

Applicant has been trying to bring out this fundamental distinction between the methodology of the subject invention and Howard '374 which has nothing to do with applicants invention. If this distinction is not now clearly apparent from claim 6 as amended a telephone interview with the Examiner is desired and suggested.

Clearly claims 6 and 7 as amended are patentable over Howard '374.